

TYRONE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Approved Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2008 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Joe Fumich, Dave Hanoute, Ed Kempisty, Mark Meisel, Laurie Radcliffe

ABSENT: Gary Butler

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Hanoute

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

- 1) Scott Dietrich, 13505 White Lake Road, stated that he wanted to address the Planning Commission regarding the Heavenly Scent request.
- 2) Jim Solden and Greg Duberg requested addition of a concept discussion for use of property at 10260 White Lake Road as a paint ball course.

Mr. Hanoute added the request to the Agenda as New Business, Item 1.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Moved by Radcliffe, seconded by Kempisty, to approve the November 9, 2008 Agenda as amended. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

- 1) November 11, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Radcliffe, seconded by Fumich, to approve the November 11, 2008 Meeting Minutes as corrected. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Page 5, Line 22: (...the Planning Commission's a response...)

Page 5, Line 38: (...and **be** allowed to speak...)

Page 5, Line 30: (...would get **feedback** on his document...)

Page 6, Line 24: (...**October 28, 2008 Planning Commission** meeting...)

Page 6, Line 26: (...**O applied** and would be...)

Page 9, Line 14: (...they may be in violation...)

Page 9, Line 24: (...to the extent described, they may be...)

Page 10, Line 7: (...rezoned **to RE**...)

Page 10, Line 21: (highest **road** weight limits...)

Page 10, Line 37: (...Mr. Hanoute **tentatively** cancelled the November 25, 2008 meeting and cancelled the December 23, 2008 meeting.)

Tyrone Township Planning Commission
Approved Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2008
Page 2

2) November 11, 2008 Ridenour Shared Driveway Public Hearing Minutes

Moved by Meisel, seconded by Kempisty, to approve the minutes as corrected.
Motion carried by unanimous voice vote

Page 1, Line 39: (...an existing driveway ~~driveway~~ adjacent to...)

Page 1, Line 43: (...~~he~~ did not want...)

CORRESPONDENCE:

1) November 26, 2008 - Communications forwarded from Clerk Keith Kremer and Trustee David Kurtz regarding roadside dumping

Mr. Meisel explained that the letter forwarded by Clerk Kremer to the Board Members concerned dumping complaints from Township residents and the status of the Township's dumping Ordinances. The memo from Mr. Kurtz was follow up information related to the County's position on dumping signs and fines.

The Township Board discussed enforcement using state, county, or local laws. Part of the discussion also involved a request for "No Dumping" signs from the County. The County response was that they would not put signs in an area unless the local municipality ordinances are more strict than County or State Ordinances. The Board's request to the Planning Commission is for identification of the Township regulations in place and recommendations to strengthen requirements from the local perspective.

Zoning Administrator George Van Hecke said that there are Township Ordinances that prohibit litter or trash, but there are no fines involved and the regulations apply to private property. Mr. Meisel explained that money from Township Ordinance enforcement fines would belong to the Township.

Chairman Hanoute asked to have a discussion of the Township's litter ordinances scheduled for a future meeting.

2) November 28, 2008 - Letter from Katherine Confer regarding the Heavenly Scent Herb Farm

Mr. Hanoute observed that the letter was in favor of the weddings being held at Heavenly Scent.

3) December 2, 2008 - Memo from Keith Kremer regarding meeting materials

After discussion, the Planning Commission decided they would like to continue receiving information via e-mail and hard copy.

Tyrone Township Planning Commission
Approved Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2008
Page 3

- 4) Mr. Hanoute said he had received a letter from Supervisor Schmidt stating that Suzanne Anderson was not able to serve as the Board's representative to the Planning Commission. At this point, the Board has not approved another nominee.

OLD BUSINESS:

- 1) Request of the Estate of Helen Bantle for land division of property at 9227 Parshallville Road to create Parcel A (approximately 5 acres gross) and remainder Parent Parcel B (32-300-031) and to realign the boundaries of proposed Parcel B and proposed Parcel X at 9165 Parshallville Road (32-300-024) as shown on the Desine, Inc. site drawings revised 10/31/08.

Attorney Dale Schaller, representing the Bantles, told the Planning Commission there had been a Special Meeting with the Board and Mr. Kempisty to identify changes which could be made to the Parent Parcel and proposed nonconforming Parcel C. The revised drawing shows Parcel C absorbed into proposed Parcel X (32-200-024) at 9165 Parshallville Road and the new legal description references the easement.

Another concern was existing easement B which crosses Parcel 024 to access Parcel 32-300-030. At present, the residence on Parcel 024 lies across the easement to Parcel 030. The boundary of Parcel 024 has been extended north into parcel 32-200-038 to provide the required 75 foot rear yard setback and room for the easement to clear the buildings on Parcel 024. At present, Easement B only provides access to Parcel 030. Parcel 024 and Parcel 32-300-021 are served by the access incorporated into Parcel X.

Township Planner Sally Hodges of McKenna Associates expressed her concerns about Remainder Parcel B (031). There is access to the southernmost part of Parcel B from a new easement located on the east side of proposed Parcel A, but in reality there is only limited access to the north portion of Parcel B. In the future, the practicality of using the 12 foot strip separating 024 and 026 for access to the remainder of Parcel B is not good planning and is not serving the interest of the owners.

Extending the 66 foot wide easement that runs along the west side of proposed Parcel A (Easement B) to the north boundary of Parcel 32-300-026 would create a 66 foot wide easement connecting the back and front portions of Parcel B. Moving the easement that crosses Parcel 024 (Parcel X) to the new north boundary line of the parcel would provide another means of access to the north part of Parcel B. As the access is proposed now, Parcel B will become a large piece of land that can only be used for a single dwelling.

Mr. Schaller said that it was the consensus of the people attending the Special Meeting with the Bantles that the owners would have to come back to the Township if they wanted to open up the north section of 32-200-031. He specifically went through it with them because they do have plans to develop the rest of Parcel B, but that will entail moving a property line and putting in a private road built to county specifications.

Tyrone Township Planning Commission
Approved Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2008
Page 4

Mr. Hanoute asked the purpose of the 12 foot wide spite strip left between parcels 024 and 026. Mr. Schaller said that if the strip was set off as a road easement, large setback requirements would have to be met. Mr. Hanoute explained that a 66 foot wide easement was required for access and public utilities whether it was for a road or a shared driveway. Their newest plans still didn't meet the requirements. Relocating the east-west part of Easement B to the north property line of 024 would comply with the Township's access easement and setback requirements.

Mr. Schaller explained that the estate didn't have the ability to demand an easement from another property owner. Mr. Hanoute observed that they did have control of Easement B running east and west across Parcel 024. It could be relocated to the north boundary of Parcel 024. Ms. Hodges said that there is language in the Ordinance which requires that access easements be placed at property lines whenever possible. Mr. Hanoute explained that moving the easement to the rear of Parcel 024 would create a corner lot and require two equal yard setbacks. Private roads only require a 50 foot front yard road setback, rather than the 100 foot road setback required for Section Line roads in the RE Zoning District (20.02.BB., p 20-12).

Mr. Meisel said that if the Bantles didn't get the easement now, that would leave them with the problem of trying to acquire an easement in the future for additional property splits. If we approve this plan, it will configure Parcel B so it can't be divided in the future. Mr. Schaller said there was access to Parcel B because access had been approved by the Road Commission (Easement A). The property was one contiguous parcel and they wouldn't need any other approvals. Mr. Meisel explained that there was legal access to the front of the property, but the rear part of Parcel B did not meet the access requirements for more than a single residential parcel and that would be noted in the approval. If they want to divide the property as proposed, it should be spelled out in the records that nobody would have the ability to split the remainder of Parcel B in the future.

Mr. Schaller asked if that meant the Planning Commission would grant conditional land division approval if they changed the Parcel 024 setback to 50 feet from the residence and connected the top of the U shaped easement to the extended Easement B. The Planning Commission said his understanding was correct.

Referring to earlier discussions about the match between the legal descriptions and the site drawing, Mr. Meisel said he thought there was a disconnect in the description of the U shaped easement which surrounded Parcel 024. Mr. Hanoute said that would be something that the Township's engineers could review for accuracy if it is a concern and the review should be referenced in the approval.

Mr. Fumich said he had concerns about the sight distance. He couldn't find any reference to a clear vision sight distance maintenance easement for proposed Easement A.

Mr. Schaller informed the Planning Commission that he and the Bantles had just decided to make some changes to their plan and would like to return with a revised request.

Tyrone Township Planning Commission
Approved Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2008
Page 5

Moved by Meisel, seconded by Fumich, to table further discussion of the Bantle Land Division request until January 13, 2009. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

- 2) Request of Heavenly Scent Herb Farm presented by Steve and Kathy Mathews for an Agri-Business Special Land Use Permit for property at 13730 White Lake Road, as stated in their application of September 11, 2006.

Attorney Chris Christenson, representing Heavenly Scent, referred to information he forwarded to the Planning Commission regarding the preliminary Special Land Use Permit approved in 2006. He requested issuance of the final permit.

The Mathews letter of September 11, 2008 (Exhibit 1) lists their request for expansion of the facility to open a café and hold special events. Attorney Christenson said that at the time the Special Land Use Permit was preliminarily approved, there was a request by the Board to upgrade the parking area. There is now a paved parking lot with approximately forty-nine spots.

Mr. Hanoute said he had concerns about Mr. Christenson's references to preliminary approval. Mr. Christenson has referred to a preliminary approval twice, but Mr. Hanoute wasn't aware that the Planning Commission had held even a preliminary Site Plan Review. He asked when the Mathews received their preliminary approval. Mr. Christiansen said it was referred to in a Planning Commission letter of October 31, 2007 (Exhibit 2). He didn't know what the approval was called, but the letter encouraged them to do the driveway.

Mr. Meisel recalled that there had been some preliminary discussion about the information the Mathews needed to provide for a restaurant facility in the lower portion of the sales building. It was the recommendation of Planner Greg Milliken that we pursue modification of the Agri-Business portion of the Ordinance. That was done and the Mathews were told that the new Ordinance would allow them to request an Agri-Business Permit for a café. The required Special Land Use Permit hearing for their request was held before adoption of the Special Use Ordinance in order to discuss how their business might be incorporated into a new Agri-Business text. Now they need to complete the rest of the Special Land Use Permit application requirements.

Township Planner Sally Hodges noted that there is no record of a complete Special Land Use Site Plan submitted with the application and there was no explanation or elaboration of the outdoor wedding concept in the Public Hearing minutes. Postponing the café to develop outdoor uses makes it appropriate to hold another Public Hearing to discuss the impact of the new use based on Special Land Use Permit conditions. Mr. Meisel noted that more than a year had elapsed since further action was taken on their original request and it should be resubmitted.

Mr. Hanoute told Mr. Christenson that the Mathews should be very specific about their requested uses for the site. The Planning Commission requires a scaled site plan and Road Commission review of the access based on the proposed use. The Mathews should

Tyrone Township Planning Commission
Approved Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2008
Page 6

provide a list of all the uses they plan to conduct on the site, where the uses will be located, whether any of the buildings will become rental halls, whether food and liquor will be served and how it will be served. Mr. Christenson said that the application will remain the same as stated in the Nov. 17, 2008 cover letter. They wanted to expand the business to allow for a café, but tabled that because of the economic climate. To expand the café, they would have to meet expenses based on the requirements of the County Building and Health Departments.

Mr. Christenson explained that the Mathews have conducted weddings for the last two seasons because they thought their Special Land Use Permit request had been approved. Their weddings have been advertised for 250 people or less. They have had approximately 20 weddings, but have only seated 200 on a few occasions. Two hundred and fifty (250) is the limit they are seeking. With their paved parking lot, they can handle up to 196 people with 4 persons per car or 147 if they are limited to 3 persons per car. An overflow parking lot has been created on the west side of the property.

There are letters from the nearest neighbors who state they have no objection to traffic or noise from the property. The most recent traffic data from Livingston County going back to 2003 shows there are 240 cars per day on average, so there will be no significant impact from increased traffic. All the food is catered and the caterers are responsible for providing their own insurance and obtaining their own permits.

Any alcohol consumed on site is not provided by Heavenly Scent. Bartender services licensed by the State of Michigan Liquor Control provide that service, and they have their own insurance. Mr. Kempisty commented that he had called the Liquor Control Commission and was given a different understanding that serving liquor there would be a violation.

Mr. Fumich recalled that when the request first came in, weddings weren't even mentioned. Ms. Radcliffe agreed. Most of the discussion was about the café. If they wanted to have 200 to 250 people there between 5:00 p.m. and midnight, that should have been brought up at the beginning.

Mr. Hanoute asked the Mathews to explain how weddings related to the primary agricultural activities taking place on the site, as required for Agri-Business Special Land Use. Fifty percent of all the food and drink served in the café must be grown on the site, but you say everything is being catered. Mr. Meisel noted that all they have right now is whatever permits they need to sell produce from the site. Mr. Hanoute explained that they have no permits for any type of retail sales at this location.

We are considering an Agri-Business Special Land Use permit and we need to determine how weddings qualify as agri-business. That needs to be discussed at a Public Hearing. Mr. Christenson explained that the Mathews were asking for a wedding and reception Special Land Use Permit. Mr. Hanoute told Mr. Christenson that party halls weren't categories allowed as a Special Land Use in the FR Zoning District. He asked Mr. Christenson to reference the particular zoning category that allowed party or rental halls in

Tyrone Township Planning Commission
Approved Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2008
Page 7

the FR Zoning District. The only thing close is Agri-Business and that is a district that is a use created especially for the Mathews to permit the retail sales of agricultural products in a Residential Zoning District. Mr. Christenson said the matter had been discussed at a previous meeting with the Township. Mr. Hanoute replied that weddings weren't discussed as part of the original request.

Mr. Meisel recalled that something about weddings had been included as a vague reference tied to the café use. As we worked through the Agri-Business ordinance, a lot of consideration was given to the Heavenly Scent site and we stretched the agricultural sales envelope for them. The word "wedding" wasn't mentioned and no mechanism was provided for it in the ordinance standards. Mr. Hanoute recalled that Mr. Byerely specifically asked if dancing and drinking would occur on the site and the answer was, "No."

Ms. Radcliffe noted that the original parking lot discussion had to do with the bus tour groups. We wanted to make sure that there was sufficient area for them to turn around on the site. There wasn't enough parking on the site to meet increased use and the Mathews had plans to park across the street for special occasions. Mr. Christenson said the extra parking had been moved back onto the Mathews' property because some liability concerns had been expressed about crossing Tipsico Lake Road to get to the Heavenly Scent property.

Mr. Christenson said if weddings aren't a Special Use allowed in the Agri-Business Ordinance, the Mathews will seek to include it. The weddings are held in their gardens while the receptions take place in tents. A fee is charged for the wedding and the reception is included in the price of the wedding. They have only had 20 weddings in the last two years and they haven't had any complaints.

Mr. Hanoute said he had personal concerns about noise, hours of operation, parking, site lighting, site safety, the number of events and so on. This use wouldn't be a problem in a commercial zoning district, but there can be negative impacts in a residential district. This is an herb farm with limitations that should be adhered to. The big wedding receptions and the hours from 5:00 - 12:00 with drinking and dancing are problems.

Mr. Christenson said seven of the closest neighbors have sent letters in support. The elevation of the property at the road is higher than the elevation of the property behind the barn and the site is surrounded by mature trees. Mr. Hanoute said the problem will still be noise. Even though he lives a mile from the freeway, he can hear the trucks down shifting on US 23. Mr. Fumich felt that operation at that location was unsafe at night after guests had been drinking.

Mr. Hanoute observed that there were enough concerns about the wedding reception use to require that the applicant reapply for a Special Land Use and provide more detail. There is a process to go through in order to get a Special Land Use Permit. A Public Hearing and Sight Plan Review are steps in the process. Prior to adoption of the Agri-Business

Tyrone Township Planning Commission
Approved Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2008
Page 8

Ordinance, their herbal sales business was considered a pre-existing non-conforming use. Their request for a café in connection with their herb sales initiated the Agri-Business Ordinance revisions. There was nothing discussed about party rental space.

Mr. Mesiel observed that as the herb farm popularity has increased, the volume of people and the number of events has increased, and the use has become more noticeable and visible. He asked the Mathews to differentiate clearly between the café use which we considered to be associated with agri-business and the special events which are separate uses. If you are only interested in special events, focus on those and exclude the café. One use can be clearly accommodated under the Agri-Business provision, the other use not so clearly.

Mr. Hanoute said another option would be to locate to a zoning district where the party hall concept could be accommodated and request a rezoning for that use. Ms. Hodges explained to the Mathews that any rezoning request would have to fit the Master Plan Future Land Use category for a particular parcel.

Mr. Hanoute asked Mr. Christenson to make sure the final LCRC review of the White Lake Road access was provided for site plan review. There were some conditions listed on the first review, and from the drawing provided by the Mathews, it looks like some of their parking is in the right-of-way. Even if the County allows it, the Township does not allow encroachments in the right-of-way.

Ms. Hodges said the Site Plan should show the tent locations, the dance floor location, and the buildings and areas should be labeled to show their function. Mr. Hanoute said there would have to be more detail on the plan showing topography, drainage, site lighting, parking lot lighting, and overflow parking areas when it gets to the Public Hearing.

Ms. Mathews said they started the weddings because the café was too expensive to get going. People want to have their weddings here because of the country location. The weddings are in the gardens, which is considered part of the Agri-Business. If it rains we can go in the tent. We provide parking attendants to control traffic. There are two restrooms in the shop, and they bring in porta-potties. So far, they haven't had one complaint about the weddings. The neighbors don't complain, and they did mention garden weddings when they were here before. Mr. Mathews commented that they couldn't afford to relocate their business to a commercial area.

Mr. Hanoute said he wasn't being critical of them or what they wanted to do at this point, but the Township should shut down any operation that isn't authorized by the Zoning Ordinance. Once they come back to the Planning Commission with a complete application, we can set a public hearing date and go forward with the process. Mr. Christenson said the Mathews already have some weddings for 2009 booked in advance. They might have to ask for special consideration, if they can't get the problem resolved in time.

Tyrone Township Planning Commission
Approved Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2008
Page 9

- 4) Comments regarding the draft of proposed revisions to Zoning Ordinance Articles 11 (PUD) and 12A (PCS) forwarded to the Township Attorney and the Livingston County Department of Planning

The Planning Commission was informed that the Ordinance language is being reviewed by the Attorney and the Livingston County Planning Department.

Mr. Meisel thought that we should look at hours of operation for the PUD and PCS sites during the construction process. Mr. Hanoute also suggested language about dust control and street cleaning. They could be flexible based on the proximity of residential development. Ms. Hodges suggested adding the additional language to the operation section (11.02.P) for discussion at the hearing.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1) Request of Jim Soldan and Greg Duberg for installation of a "Paint Ball" facility at 10260 White Lake Road near the intersection with Old US 23 (Parcel 04-300-007)

Mr. Soldan told the Planning Commission that Paint Ball is a growing recreational activity. The contests have stringent rules and are highly regulated by referees. Participants must rent approved guns and paint balls. Most of the activity occurs on weekends, and use during the week is by reservation in advance. They plan to provide parking for 40 or 50 cars. The proximity of the site to the expressway will limit traffic on local streets. The use is considered low impact and no permanent buildings will be constructed on the site. There is a 40 degree minimum temperature requirement so the season usually runs from mid-March to mid-November. The use would be similar to the Archery Club located in the Township. The property is zoned M-1 at the White Lake Road frontage and RE behind the cemetery.

The Planning Commission noted that :

- Outdoor recreation activities are allowed in RE and B-2 Zoning Districts, but not in M-1;
- Both parcels could be rezoned to RE or B-2 Zoning where outdoor recreation is allowed as a 'Special Land Use;'
- The proposed driveway location should be reviewed by the Livingston County Road Commission before designing the site;
- The Master Plan shows commercial development along some of the US-23 frontage south of White Lake Road;
- A Special Land Use Permit is required for commercial recreational use;
- B-2 Zoning would be easy to convert to PCS zoning;
- The property will be adjacent to future Commercial or Public Service Zoning Districts and is bordered by a cemetery;
- Parcel B and Parcel C are illegal parcels and should be combined with the adjacent parcels;
- The property contains wetlands and a small stream;
- There will be concerns about access, types of structures, sanitary facilities, parking,

Tyrone Township Planning Commission
Approved Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2008
Page 10

- lighting, regulated wetlands and stream crossings,
- Copies of the rules for use of the course must be provided for Special Land Use Permit review;
- Information regarding buffers, noise, and hours of operation will be required;
- All perimeters will have to be established at a distance of 150 feet from adjacent residential zoning districts.
- A wetlands delineation and evaluation will be required whether the wetlands are regulated or not; and
- Pinckney officials should be contacted for information related to their paint ball course experiences.

Mr. Duberg and Mr. Soldan told the Planning Commission that:

- They wanted to know if there would be enough Planning Commission interest in a paint ball course to request a rezoning;
- They planned to locate the driveway and parking on the east property line;
- They wanted to retain the natural appearance of the site by using a temporary sales structure brought to and from the site;
- Hay bales will be used for screening in the rapid fire speedball area;
- Some brush clearance will occur in portions of the wooded course;
- The closest courses are located in Pinckney, Davison and Metamora;
- All equipment will be rented or purchased on site;
- The muzzle velocity of the paint ball guns will be regulated;
- The paint is water soluble and the paint balls must be purchased on site;
- Courses are usually open to the public on the weekends, and on weekdays for special events;
- Sites are frequently used by Police Departments, church groups, and high-school groups;
- A maximum number of players will be established;
- Speedball is played in an open field and lasts about 20 to 30 minutes;
- Games in the wooded area involve more people and last longer;
- They plan to schedule morning and afternoon sessions;
- Perimeters could be established with fencing and netting;
- Referees will be located on the course and players will have to wear goggles;
- The activity won't be much noisier than US-23 traffic;
- Their office and equipment storage might be housed in a trailer either left on site or removed when the site is closed; and
- This will be a temporary use while the property is for sale.

Mr. Hanoute recommended that Mr. Duberg and Mr. Soldan consider rezoning of the property to one of the Zoning Districts (B-2 or RE) which would be compatible with the proposed Special Land Use before bringing in a site plan for review.

- 2) Comments from Scott Dietrich, 13505 White Lake Road, regarding the request of Heavenly Scent Herb Farm for an Agri-Business Special Land Use Permit

Mr. Dietrich said he had presented a big information packet to Mr. VanHecke pointing out the Ordinance violations at Heavenly Scent. He wanted it added into the Public Hearing information. All of the Planning Commission members should go and see the operation that is going on down there. There have been a lot of changes made that haven't been approved. There are too many different businesses going on at one address.

OTHER BUSINESS FROM MEMBERS:

1) Concrete Crushing

Mr. Meisel said that there was a discussion at the Board Meeting regarding the concrete crushing operations at Bentley Sand and Gravel. The Bentleys have been in operation for a long time and have crushed concrete in the past.

The Bentleys are crushing the old concrete surface of Silver Lake Road for use as a base for the new road surface. They regard this as a recycling operation. At this point, our Ordinance says crushing is not allowed. The Board would like the Planning Commission to consider options or opportunities for concrete crushing, how it should be regulated if it is allowed, and recommendations for a Zoning or Regulatory Ordinance amendment if it is allowed.

There have been no recent complaints about concrete crushing, but there were some brought up a few years ago. At that time, their bond was increased to cover the cost of concrete removal if they ceased to operate. Under current conditions, the Board feels concrete crushing may be a reasonable use at their site. It is more economical to crush concrete and reuse it for roadbed material than to use crushed limestone.

Mr. Hanoute asked if the Township has requested any information about the operation and impact of the gravel trucks on the Township's road system. Ms. Hodges asked if the Bentleys currently maintained hours of operation or had plans for removal of re-rod and other debris from the site. Mr. Meisel said that the site is isolated and recycling close to a site where the material will be used is desirable. The other crushing operation in the Township is court ordered and restricted to material uncovered on the site.

Mr. Hanoute asked to have a review of the Extractive Ordinance scheduled at the same time as review of the dumping regulations.

2) Verhelle Request for a Home Occupation

Mr. Meisel reported that Ms. Verhelle's request to provide counseling services in her home on Runyan Lake Road was approved by the Board.

3) Lake Frontage Yard Locations

Mr. Hanoute said he had been asked by Mr. Schmidt to give consideration to the current regulations regarding lake property and reversal of the front and rear yard definitions.

Tyrone Township Planning Commission
Approved Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2008
Page 12

Currently, storage is not allowed in the front yard (street side) of lake front property.

Mr. Hanoute asked why Township residents should have to suffer the appearance of boats and trailers or storage buildings in lakeside front yards when other Township residents were not allowed to locate storage in their front yards. Ms. Radcliffe observed that the Township allows storage in side yards as well as rear yards.

Mr. Hanoute asked to have the subject of yard definitions and boat storage added to a future Planning Commission Agenda. Ms. Hodges commented that she had just finished some regulations for Lake Orion and could bring a copy of them to the next meeting. Mr. Meisel recalled that a similar question was raised about storage building locations and it was determined that residents have the ability to request a ZBA hardship variance based on individual parcel locations and circumstances.

ZONING ADMINISTRATORS REPORT:

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS:

BOARD ACTION:

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

Litter Ordinance Review
Extractive Ordinance Review
Boat Storage Option Review

NEXT MEETINGS:

January 13, 2009 - Regular Meeting and Ordinance Amendment Public Hearing
January 27, 2009 - Regular Meeting
February 10, 2009 - Regular Meeting

ADJOURNMENT: 9:25 p.m. Chairman Hanoute



Laurie Radcliffe, Secretary
Tyrone Township Planning Commission



Barbara Burtch, Recording Secretary
Tyrone Township Planning Commission